

**REMARKS**

Claims 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 24 and 28-34 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 1, 5, 8, 13-15, 25 and 26 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-3, 5, 8-10, 13-23 and 25-27 remain pending in the present application. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable.

Initially, the applicants note that all claim amendments have merely added limitations from the dependent claims to the independent claims. For each of the independent claims that were amended, the applicants have noted in this remarks section the dependent claims from which the limitations were added. Thus, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter the amendments in this response because the amendments do not necessitate a new search.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 8-10, 15-19 and 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,359,721 to Kempf et al. ("the Kempf reference"). *Office Action*, ¶ 3, pages 2-9. The Examiner also rejected claims 28-29 and 32-34 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,546,546 to Van Doorn ("the Van Doorn reference"). *Office Action*, ¶ 4, pages 9-11. The Examiner also rejected claims 4-7, 11, 20, 24-27 and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kempf reference in view of the Van Doorn reference. *Office Action*, ¶ 5, pages 11-17. Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kempf reference in view of U.S. Patent 6,199,152 to Kelly et al. ("the Kelly reference") in further view of the Van Doorn

reference.

Claim 1 has been amended to include all the recitations of cancelled claim 4. Thus, the rejection of the limitations of the currently amended claim 1 is based on the Kempf reference in view of the Van Doorn reference. As correctly pointed out by the Examiner, the Kempf reference did not teach the limitations of claim 4. However, the Examiner contends that the Van Doorn reference teaches these limitations. The Van Doorn reference describes a JVM using hardware protection domains to protect Java applets. *Van Doorn reference*, col. 2, lines 43-44. The "protection domains" are described as "a mapping of virtual to physical pages together with a set of domain specific events." *Id.* at col. 4, lines 64-65. Each protection domain has a view of its own subtree of the name space. *Id.* at col. 5, lines 23-25. The view includes a set of physical memory pages to virtual mappings. *Id.* at col. 8, lines 47-49. In order to access methods not within a caller's protection domain, a cross protection domain call must be performed which passes through a Java Nucleus to control access and use CPU resources. *Id.* at col. 8, lines 20-22.

In contrast, claim 1 recites "requesting attachment of the second domain to the first domain when the second domain is determined not to be within the protection view of the first domain" and "attaching the second domain to the first domain using an attachment mechanism." As described above, the Van Doorn reference teaches that the Java Nucleus control access to the different domains. As stated in the Van Doorn reference "[t]he protection domains themselves cannot manipulate the memory mappings or the access rights of their virtual memory pages." *Van Doorn reference*, col. 8, lines 56-58. Furthermore, the entire thrust of the Van Doorn reference is for the Java Nucleus to broker access between the various domains. *Id.* at col.

8, line 52 - col. 9, line 30; col. 9, line 40 - col. 10, line 60.

This disclosure is in direct contrast to the recitation of claim 1 that a second domain is attached to a first domain. As described in the specification, the process of attaching includes altering the protection view of the requesting domain to include the protection domain in the symbol's protection domain. *Specification*, page 30, lines 12-14. The Van Doorn reference specifically states that the domains have no control over the access. Thus, they cannot alter any protection views to allow access.

Accordingly, the applicants respectfully submit that the Kempf reference and the Van Doorn reference, either alone or in combination, neither teach nor suggest "requesting attachment of the second domain to the first domain when the second domain is determined not to be within the protection view of the first domain" and "attaching the second domain to the first domain using an attachment mechanism" as recited in claim 1. Thus, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 1 and all claims depending therefrom (claims 2-3 and 7).

Claim 8 has been amended to include the limitations of claims 11 and 12. The amended claim 8 recites "altering the task protection view to include a protection view of the second domain." Thus, for the same reasons as described above with reference to claim 1, the applicants respectfully submit that the Kempf reference, the Van Doorn reference and the Kelly reference, either alone or in combination, neither teach nor suggest the above recited limitation. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 8 and all claims depending therefrom (claims 9-10, 13-14).

Claim 15 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 24. The amended

claim 15 recites "a number of protection domains, at least one of the number of protection domains owning a portion of the system space, wherein each of the number of protection domains includes a protection view defining a set of the number of protection domains to which unprotected access may be made." Thus, for the same reasons as described above with reference to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 is also allowable. Specifically, the Van Doorn reference teaches that the domains include a view, but there is no teaching in the Van Doorn reference that the view includes other domains. The view is limited to its own domain. The Java Nucleus may have a view of the entire system, but the java Nucleus is not one of the protection domains. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 15 and all claims depending therefrom (claims 16-23 and 25-27).

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the amendments and remarks submitted above, the Applicants respectfully submit that the present case is in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner have been addressed, and a favorable action on the merits is thus earnestly requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

8/3/04

By:

  
Michael J. Marcin (Reg. No. 48,198)

FAY KAPLUN & MARCIN, LLP  
150 Broadway, Suite 702  
New York, NY 10038  
(212) 619-6000 (phone)  
(212) 619-0276 (facsimile)